

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-14 are pending in the present application. By virtue of this response, no claims have been cancelled, claims 1, 8, and 14 have been amended and no new claims have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-14 are currently under consideration. Amendment and cancellation of certain claims is not to be construed as a dedication to the public of any of the subject matter of the claims as previously presented.

Examiner Interview

Applicant appreciates the time the Examiner (and the Examiner's primary) took for a telephonic interview on Monday, November 3, 2003. In addition to the Examiner, the Examiner's primary, and the undersigned, inventor Kent Ohlund was also present. Mr. Ohlund is an employee of assignee Centric Software. In addition to the subject patent application, the discussion also included patent application no. 09/513,264.

During the interview, the independent claims were discussed. The cited references were not specifically discussed. That is, there was no discussion of a particular reference by name. However, the prior art in general was discussed with reference to the claims.

During the interview, it was agreed that Applicant would amend the independent claims to include the features of:

the objects are models of mechanical systems; and

the rate at which each service executes is based on the simulated attributes.

The Examiner indicated that these amendments would overcome the present rejections. The Examiner also indicated that further searching would be required.

Claim Objection

The Office maintains the objection to Claim 14 and suggests an amendment to clarify the language of Claim 14. Applicant appreciates the Examiner suggestion and has amended claim 14 substantially as suggested by the Examiner. As such it is respectfully requested that the objection to Claim 14 be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Office maintains the rejection of Claims 1-14 as being unpatentable over Willis et al. U.S. Patent 5,999,734 in view of Srivastava et al. U.S. Patent 5,752,034 and in further view of Bigo et al. U.S. Patent 5,261,099. The Office has withdrawn the original rejection of Claims 1 and 8 over Rompaey et al. U.S. Patent 5,870,588 in view of Ueno et al. U.S. Patent 5,301,331 but a new rejection with these references has been applied.

In view of the claim amendments, as discussed during the Examiner interview, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are patentable over the references relied upon by the Examiner. Applicant understands and appreciates that the Examiner will perform further searching based on the amended claims, and Applicant eagerly awaits the results of this further searching.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have, by way of the amendments and remarks presented herein, made a sincere effort to overcome rejections and address all issues that were raised in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested. If it is determined that a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicant(s) petition(s) for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no. 514292000100.

Dated: November 14, 2003

Respectfully submitted,



By _____
Alan S. Hodes
Registration No.: 38,185
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
755 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, California 94304
(650) 813-5622
Attorneys for Applicant